

## **Remarks**

The present Amendment is submitted in response to the non-final Office Action dated May 25, 2010, which set a three-month period for response.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,274,904 to Proise (Proise) in view of US Patent No. 6,535,100 to Forrs (Forrs), claim 6 is rejected under §103(a) over Proise in view of Forrs further in view of US Patent No. 3,436,704 to Keto, et al. (Keto) and claim 8 is rejected under §103(a) over Proise in view of Forrs further in view of US Patent No. 3,467,931 to Dutton (Dutton).

In response, applicants have amended independent claim 1 better distinguish Proise and Forrs, whether the proposed combination is taken alone or in further combination with either Keto or Dutton.

Amended independent claim 1 now recites a magnetic pole for magnetic levitation vehicles having a core (1) with a center axis (5) and a winding (16) in form of a disk having a multitude of layers (10) in a radial direction applied on it, said winding being formed by a conductor strip (17) wound around said core (1) to form said multiple layers (10), characterized in that said conductor strip (17) at its longitudinal rims (17a, 17b) placed at a distance in the direction of the center axis (5) is so tailor-cut that its width increases steadily from the core (1) towards an outside until the width reaches a maximum value (b2).

Support for the amendments to independent claim 1 is found in the Specification at page 3, lines 18-32 and at page 4, lines 14-16.

Applicants agree that Proise discloses a coil (122; Fig. 5b) for use in maglev vehicles comprising a core with a center axis and a winding (12, 122) in a form of a disk applied on it, where the winding is formed of a conductor strip 14.

Applicants further agree that Proise does not teach or suggest that Proise's conductor strip 14 is tailor cut so that its width increases steadily from the core towards the outside until it reaches its highest value.

But while the Examiner asserts that Forrs discloses a conductor strip 110 that is so tailor cut that its width increases steadily from its to core towards its outside, where the width reaches its highest value (col. 7, lines 34-42; Figs. 1E, 1F), and that it would have been obvious to modify Proise by what is taught by Forrs to suitably size the winding strip to meet the required creepage distance and clearance (col. 1, lines 49-55, Figs. 5, 6), and realize the invention as claimed, applicants respectfully disagree.

Forrs relates to insulated transformer foil windings, such as foil winding assembly 190 highlighted in Fig. 1. Forrs foil winding assembly is used to produce a reduced margin or margin free coil design transformer (Figs. 6 and 7). The winding assembly 190 includes winding portion 192 and folded breakout 194 to meet creepage distance, clearance and distance through insulation requirements.

A foil strip 100 is shown in Fig. 1E to include a winding portion 112 with a

breakout portion 114 having a reduced width C as compared with width B of winding portion 112. The foil strip 110 is folded at 150 (see Figs. 1E, 1F) to position the breakout portion. A sloped edge 113 is provided next to fold 150 to divide the foil strip 110 into the breakout portion 114 and winding portion 112. The sloped edge 113 acts as a transition region to change the width between the breakout portion 114 and winding portion 112.

While sloped edge 113 increases its width over the short distance it comprises, from width C of breakout 114 to width B of winding portion 112, winding portion 112 is not a conductor strip tailor cut so that its width increases steadily as its length extends and forms a winding, the winding extending radially from a core towards an outside until it reaches its highest value. That is, the width of Forrs' winding portion 112 does not change over its length, as claimed.

As such, the skilled artisan would not have found it obvious to modify Poise by the teachings of Forrs. For that matter, modifying Poise by the teachings of Forrs, still would not realize a magnetic pole with a for magnetic levitation vehicles having a core with a center axis and winding in form of a disk having a multitude of layers in a radial direction applied on it, the winding formed with a conductor strip wound around the core to form the multiple layers and having at its longitudinal rims placed at a distance in the direction of the center axis being tailor-cut so that its width increases steadily from the core towards an outside until the width reaches a maximum value.

Amended independent claim 1 and claims 2-6 are therefore patentable

under §103(a) over Poise in view of Forrs, and applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

In response to the rejection of claim 7 under §103(a) over Poise in view of Forrs further in view of Keto, applicants respectfully assert that that Keto suffers the same shortcomings of Poise in view of Forrs, as asserted above in response to the rejection of claim 1, from which claim 7 depends. None of Poise, Forrs or Keto disclose a winding formed with a conductor strip wound around the core to form the multiple layers and having at its longitudinal rims placed at a distance in the direction of the center axis being tailor-cut so that its width increases steadily from the core towards an outside until the width reaches a maximum value.


Hence, claim 7 is not obvious under §103(a) over Poise in view of Forrs further in view of Keto and applicants respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection thereunder.

In response to the rejection of claim 8 under §103(a) over Poise in view of Dutton further in view of Keto, applicants respectfully assert that that Dutton suffers the same shortcomings of Poise in view of Forrs, as asserted above in response to the rejection of claim 1, from which claim 7 depends. None of Poise, Forrs or Dutton disclose a winding formed with a conductor strip wound around the core to form the multiple layers and having at its longitudinal rims placed at a distance in the direction of the center axis being tailor-cut so that its width increases steadily from the core towards an outside until the width reaches a maximum value.

Hence, claim 8 is not obvious under §103(a) over Poise in view of Forrs further in view of Dutton and applicants respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection thereunder.

Accordingly, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and action to this end is courteously solicited. However, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 27,233  
103 East Neck Road  
Huntington, New York 11743  
631 549 4700